पुलिस को कहता है। पुलिस के बाद वह राज्य सरकार के पास जाता है। जब कहीं सुनाई नहीं होती तो फिर वह गरीब आदमी इस महान सदन की ओर देखता है। जैसे ही अवसर मिला तो उन्होंने आकर फरियाद की कि तीन हफ्ते के बाद भी अभी तक लड़की का सुराग नहीं मिल रहा है और न ही पुलिस उसकी मदद कर रही है। तो मैं इस महान सदन से आपके द्वारा प्रार्थना और निवेदन करूंगा कि इस तरह की घटना की तीन हफ्ते से जिसके जांच और कोई कुछ हो नहीं रहा है, उस छज्जू राम कारपेंटर की लड़की जिसका नाम रचना है उसे 21 फरवरी को किडनेप किया गया, उसको जल्दी से जल्दी बरामद किया जाए।

मान्यवर, दूसरी घटना हरियाणा की एक और है कि मोती लाल अग्रवाल जो एक हफ्ते पहले हिसार से दिल्ली आया था। वह हिसार का रहने वाला है। वह शाम के 8 बजे रोहडा, सांपला और रोहतक शहर के बीच में पड़ता है रात को 6-7 गुंडों ने उसको और उसकी महिला को रोका, दोनों को और अटैची लेकर खेतों में ले गए। इस दौरान उसकी महिला के जेवर लूटे और सारा जब लूट चुके 50-60 हजार का माल ले लिया तो इतने में पीछे से गाड़ी आ गई और वहां गाड़ी रुकी उसकी कार के पास और वह रुकने की वजह से वह गुंडे माल ले कर भागे। उस महिला की इज्जत बच गई।

महोदय, मैं आपसे दोबारा प्रार्थना करूंगा कि जो लड़की रचना किडनेप हुई है उसको जल्दी से जल्दी बरामद करने के लिए सरकार को कहा जाए। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपने मुझे बोलने का समय दिया इसके लिए मैं आपका बड़ा आभारी हूं। धन्यवाद।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AJIT P.K. JOGI): The House is adjourned for lunch till 2.30 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at thirty-three minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at thirty-five minutes past two of the clock

The Vice-Chairman (Miss Saroj Khaparde) in the Chair.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTION GROWING SICKNESS OF PUBLIC SECTOR UNDERTAKINGS

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Now we will take up the Resolution moved by Shri Giri Prasad on 28th Februrary, 1997, for further discussion. Shri Jalaludin Ansari had not completed his speech. So, he will now continue his speech.

श्री जलालुद्दीन अंसारी (बिहार): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदया, मैंने उस दिन बोलते हुए आई०डी०पी०एस० की चर्चा की थी और साथ ही साथ सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में जो कपड़ा उद्योग है, एन०टी०सी० की मिल है उनकी भी चर्चा की थी। तीसरा, जो एक बड़ा ही महत्वपूर्ण क्षेत्र है, वह है फर्टिलाइजर खाद की कंपनियों के कारखाने, उनकी जो आज स्थिति है उसकी ओर मैं आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहूंगा। अपने देश में आज खाद की जितनी आवश्यकता है उसके अनुरूप हमारे जो सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के कारखाने हैं वे उत्पादन नहीं कर पा रहे हैं और उसके कई कारण हैं, जिन पर सरकार गंभीरता से विचार करती नहीं, न उसका कोई समाधान ही कर पाती है। यह जो बरौनी, सिंदरी के कारखाने हैं, वर्षों से कहा जा रहा है कि इनका आधुनिकीकरण किया जाएगा। कुछ लोग इस बात का तर्क देते हैं कि कृषकों, बिलको कोपरेटिव की जो कंपनियां हैं, वह ज्यादा उत्पादन दे रही हैं। इसका एक कारण तो स्पष्ट है, जो प्रमुख कारण है, कि उनकी जो मशीनें हैं बिल्कुल नई हैं, आधुनिक हैं और इन सारी कंपनियों के कारखानों की मशीनों की एज लिमिट तो दस साल है या बारह साल है, लेकिन पिछले 20 साल से, 25 साल से वही मशीनें कार्यरत हैं। इन कंपनियों, कारखानों की मशीनों को मोडर्नाइज नहीं किया गया, जिसके कारण इनके उत्पादन में कमी होती है। सरकार बार-बार कहती है कि हम इसको रिवाइवल पैकेज के जरिए, मोडर्नाइजेशन के जरिए, आधुनिकीकरण के जरिए सही तरीके से चलाएंगे और उत्पादन को बढ़ाएंगे।

महोदया, इसी तरह से बारौनी, सिंदरी के अलावा चालचर, नामरूप, हल्दिया है, इन कारखानों की भी स्थिति अच्छी नहीं है। जो भी पैकेज बनाए जाते हैं, इसके लिए ग्रुप आफ मिनिस्टर की कमेटी भी बनाई गई, लेकिन अभी तक ग्रुप आफ मिनिस्टर्स ने क्या किया, इसकी जानकारी हम लोगों को नहीं है। जब पूछा जाता है तो कहा जाता है कि वह ग्रुप आफ मिनिस्टसर कमेटी में विचाराधीन है। तो यह कब तक विचाराधीन रहेगा? मैं इस सिलसिले में यह कहना चाहता हूं कि गोरखपुर

के भी खाद कारखान वर्षा से बंद पड़े हैं। और उत्तर प्रदेश के चुनाव से पूर्व माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने यह घोषणा की थी कि गोरखपुर के खाद कारखानों को चालू किया जाएगा, लेकिन इस सिलसिले में अभी तक कोई कारगर कदम नहीं उठाया गया है, मात्र आश्वासन दिया गया है। हम सभी जानते हैं कि यूरिया खाद, फासफेटिक खाद या पोटशिक खाद की हमको जरूरत होती है और जब हम इसे विदेश से मंगाते हैं तो हमें 8000 रुपए से भी अधिक प्रति टन देना पड़ता है और यदि हम इसका अपने देश में ही उत्पादन करते हैं तो 5600 रुपए टन ही पड़ता है। तो यह जो अंतर के रूप में हमें ज्यादा देना पड़ता है, इसको भी अपने देश में उत्पादन बढ़ाकर कम किया जा सकता है। आप सभी जानते हैं कि पिछले दिनों 133 करोड़ का यूरिया घोटाला हुआ, जिस खाद के लिए विदेश से समझौता किया गया, वह खाद पहुंची ही नहीं। ये सारी बातें सर्वविदित है, इनकी चर्चा करने की अभी जरूरत नहीं है। लेकिन हमारे जो शासक हैं, पता नहीं क्यों अपने देश में इसे पैदा ही नहीं करना चाहते, वे इसे विदेश से ही मंगाना चाहते हैं? मैं समझता हूं कि इसके पीछे यही कारण है कि विदेश से मंगाने पर गड़बड़ी करने में आसानी होती है और कमीशन मिलता है। मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि अपने देश में जो यह कमीशन सिस्टम चल गया है, इसको अगर तोड़ा नहीं गया, समाप्त नहीं किया गया तो हमारे सारे काम सही तरीके से नहीं चल सकते हैं, उन्हें सही तरीके से अंजाम नहीं दिया जा सकता।

महोदया, मैंने पिछले दिनों बोलते हुए भी कहा था कि हमारे देश के विकास के लिए, नव-निर्माण के लिए और आवश्यकताओं की पूर्ति के लिए सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र की एक अहम् भूमिका है। लेकिन मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि यह सरकार पिछले कुछ वर्षों से, जब से आर्थिक उदारीकरण की नीति अपनाई गई है, सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के प्रति उतना ध्यान नहीं दे रही है, जितना कि दिया जाना चाहिये था और इस दिशा में जो सही समाधान निकाला जाना चाहिए था, सरकार उसमें पीछे हट रही है जिसके कारण दिनों-दिन हमारे सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के कारखाने और कम्पनियां बीमार होती जा रही हैं। उनको बीमारी से मुक्त करने के लिए जो समुचित उपाय हमारी सरकार को करने चाहिये थे, सरकार नहीं कर पा रही है। हमारी जो यह संयुक्त मोर्चा सरकार है, उसने सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र की भूमिका को अपने कॉमन मिनिमम् प्रोग्राम में भी दर्शाया है और उसमें उसने लिखा है कि:—

> "विकास के प्रारम्भिक दशकों में सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र ने अग्रणी भूमिका अदा की। सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र भारतीय उद्योग का एक महत्वपूर्ण संघटक बना रहेगा"।

सरकार कहती है 'बना रहेगा' आगे लिखा है कि:—

> "संयुक्त मोर्चा सरकार सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र को मजबूत एवं प्रतिस्पर्धात्मक बनाने में मदद देगी"।

लेकिन हमारा कहना है कि इसको मजबूत व प्रतिस्पर्धात्मक बनाने में वह कामयाब हो सके, इसके लिए कोई उपाय अभी तक नहीं किया गया है। हम संयुक्त मोर्चा सरकार और माननीय मंत्री जी से कहना चाहेंगे कि अपने देश की जनता के सामने सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र को मजबूत बनाने और सफल प्रतियोगी बनाने के लिए जो आपने घोषणा की है, उस घोषणा को आप तहेदिल से अमल में लाने का प्रयास कीजिए। आगे इसी में कहा गया है कि:—

> "गैर महत्वपूर्ण एवम् गैर राजनीतिक क्षेत्रों से सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र की वापसी के सवाल पर सावधानी से विचार किया जाएगा, लेकिन मजदूरों एवम् कर्मचारियों को रोजगार की सुरक्षा निश्चित की जाएगी या विकल्प के रूप में पुनः प्रशिक्षण या पुनः नियुक्ति का अवसर प्रदान किया जाएगा"।

मैं मानता हूं कि यह सरकार कह सकती है कि सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र की कुछ कंपनियां और कारखाने गैर-महत्वपूर्ण बन गए हैं और उनको वह सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र से अलग करना चाहती है। तो उसके लिए क्या कोई योजना है, क्या आपने उसको प्वाइंट-आऊट किया है कि कौन सी यूनिट्स गैर-महत्वपूर्ण हो गई है? साथ ही साथ सरकार का कहना है कि मजदूरों और कर्मचारियों का रोजगार सुरक्षित रहेगा और विकल्प के रूप में उन्हें पुनः प्रशिक्षित किया जाएगा और उनको पुनर्नियुक्त का भी अवसर दिया जाएगा लेकिन पिछले दिनों में देखा गया है कि गोल्डन हैंड शेक स्कीम के तहत बहुत से मजदूरों को विदा कर दिया गया कुछ राशि देकर। यह जो इनकी स्कीम है, अगर वह भी चलती रहेगी तो ये प्रशिक्षण कब देंगे, उनको पुनर्नियुक्ति की गारंटी कब देंगे?

महोदया, इसी तरह से इनकी स्वेच्छा से सेवा-निवृत्त होने की जो योजना है, उसको ये अभी तक जारी रखे हुए हैं। इससे आशंका होती है कि कॉमन मिनिमम प्रोग्राम में ये कबूल करते हैं लेकिन उसको कार्यान्वित करने में जिस मजबूती के साथ आगे आना चाहिये, उसके लिए न कोई योजना है और न कोई तैयारी है। जब तक विश्वास और दृढ़-निश्चय के भाव के साथ इस दिशा में हम आगे नहीं बढ़ेंगे तब तक सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र की जो ये बीमार

कठिनाइयां है, इनको सरकार पुनर्जीवित नहीं कर सकती है। इसलिए मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि इस दिशा में ठोस कदम सरकार को उठाना चाहिए और इस सदन को और इस देश को बताना चाहिये कि सरकार इस दिशा में क्या करने जा रही है?

महोदया, मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूं कि औद्योगिक बीमारी के संबंध में भी सरकार ने कॉमन मिनिमम प्रोग्राम में कहा है कि औद्योगिक बीमारी का सामना करने के लिए एक नया कानून बनाया जाएगा और औद्योगिक एवं वित्तीय पुर्ननिर्माण बोर्ड का पूरी तरह पुनर्गठन किया जाएगा और कानून में छोटे उद्योगों में बीमारी का सामना करने के लिए एक अलग कार्यविधि की व्यवस्था की जाएगी और बीमार उद्योगों का पुनर्वास करने और उन्हें पुनर्जीवित करने का प्रयास किया जाएगा एवं मजदूरों के हितों की रक्षा की जाएगी।

महोदया, अभी कल ही हम लोगों ने एक बिल पारित किया है। उसमें भी यह स्पष्ट नहीं है कि आई०आर०बी०आई० को जो हमने एक कंपनी में बदल दिया है, वह कंपनी इन बीमार कारखानों के लिए क्या प्रावधान करेगी। इसका उसमें कोई स्पष्ट संकेत नहीं है। इसलिए हम चाहेंगे कि सरकार इस दिशा में स्पष्ट नीति बनाए और उसके लिए आवश्यक कार्यक्रम की घोषणा करे। साथ ही साथ जो हमारे सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के बीमार कारखाने हैं, उनके लिए सरकार एक टाइम-बाऊंड प्रोग्राम बनाए।

ताकि सही मायनों में हमारी जो बीमार कम्पनियां और कारखाने हैं उनको पुनरोद्धार योजना के माध्यम से ठीक किया जा सके और उत्पादन को बढ़ाया जा सके और हम अपने देश में भी जनता की आवश्यकताओं को पूरा कर सकें और विदेशों में भी अपने माल को बेच करके विदेशी मुद्रा का भी अर्जन कर सकें और ग्लोबल मार्केट की जो आर्थिक नीतियां हैं उसमें अगर हम उत्पादन ही नहीं कर पाएंगे तो न दवा के क्षेत्र में, न खाद के क्षेत्र में, न टैक्सटाईल के क्षेत्र में तो यह ग्लोबल मार्केट में प्रवेश करने की उनकी जो नीति हैं उसमें कौन सा लाभ उठा पाएंगे। इसलिए हम कहना चाहेंगे कि देश के हित में और देश की जनता के हित में होगा कि एक स्पष्ट नीति के साथ नेक नीयती और तहे दिल से सरकार ने जो वायदा किया है उसको अमली जामा पहनाएं।

इन्ही शब्दों के साथ में गिरी प्रसाद जी के संकल्प का पुरजोर समर्थन करते हुए मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं।

[] श्री जलालुद्दीन अंसारी "बिहार": आप समाजवादी मेहमान थे। मैंने उस दिन बोलते हुए आई-डी-पी-एल- की चर्चा की थी और साथ ही साथ सावन जूट मिल्स जो कि बड़ा अच्छा चल रहा है, इसकी चर्चा की थी। तीसरा एक बड़ा ही महत्वपूर्ण सेक्टर है वह है टेक्सटाईल खादी की मशीनों के कारखाने। इसी तरह से आज इस्पात है इसकी तरफ मैं आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूं। अपने देश में आज खादी की जितनी जरूरत है उसके अनुरूप हमारे जो सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के कारखाने हैं वह उत्पादन नहीं कर पा रहे हैं। और इसके कई कारण हैं। जैसे सरकार समय से विचार नहीं करती है। इसको समाधान ही कर पाती है। यह जो सरकारी कारखाने हैं। वर्षों से कहा जा रहा है कि इनकी जल्द बंदी की जाए। कुछ लोग इस बात को तर्क देते हैं कि सरकार को बजाय आधुनिकीकरण के जो कंपनियां हैं। वह ज्यादा उत्पादन दे रही हैं। इसका एक कारण तो स्पेशलिटी है। जो पुराने कारीगर हैं कि इनकी जो मशीनें हैं बिल्कुल नई हैं। आधुनिक हैं और इन सारी कंपनियों के कारखानों की उम्र की औसत उम्र कितने साल है? बारह साल है।

[] Transliteration in Arabic Script.

اٹھایا گیا ہے صرف یقین دھانی کرائی گئی ہے - ہم سبھی جانتے ہیں کہ "یورپا کھاد" "فاسفورٹک کھاد" یا "پوٹیشک کھاد" کی ہمکو ضرورت ہوتی ہے اور جب ہم انکو ودیش سے منگاتے ہیں تو ہمیں ۸ ہزار روپئے سے بھی زیادہ فی ٹن دینا پڑتا ہے اور اگر ہم اسکا اپنے دیش میں ہی اتپادن کرتے ہیں تو ۵۹۰۰ روپیہ ٹن ہی پڑتا ہے - تو یہ جو انتر کے روپ میں ہمیں زیادہ دینا پڑتا ہے اسکو بھی اپنے دیش میں اتپادن بڑھا کر کم کیا جا سکتا ہے - آپ سبھی جانتے ہیں کہ پچھلے دنوں ۱۳۲ کروڑ کا یورپا کھاد منگوایا گیا تھا - جس کھاد کو اپنے ودیش سے منگوایا گیا وہ کھاد پہنچی ہی نہیں - یہ ساری باتیں مسرو ودت ہیں - اتنی چرچا کرنے کی ابھی ضرورت نہیں ہے - لیکن ہمارے جو شاسک ہیں پتہ نہیں کیوں اپنے دیش میں اسے پیدا ہی نہیں کرنا چاہتے - وہ اسے ودیش سے ہی منگانا چاہتے ہیں - میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ اسکے پیچھے یہی کارن ہے کہ ودیش سے منگانے پر کمیشن لینے میں آسانی ہوتی ہے - اور کمیشن ملتا ہے - میں کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ اپنے دیش میں جو یہ کمیشن سسٹم شروع ہوا ہے اسکو اگر توڑا نہیں گیا - ختم نہیں کیا گیا تو ہمارے سارے

لیکن پچھلے بیس سال سے وہی مشینیں کام کر رہی ہیں - ان کمپنیوں کے کارخانوں کی مشینوں کو ماڈرنائز نہیں کیا گیا - جسکے کارن انکے اتپادن میں کمی ہوتی ہے - سرکار بار بار کہتی ہے کہ ہم اسکو ریورائول پیکیج کے ذریعہ - ماڈرنائزیشن کے ذریعہ آدھونیکیکرن کے ذریعہ صحیح طریقہ سے چلائیں گے اور اتپادن کو بڑھائیں گے -

مہودے - اسی طرح سے بروڑی - سندری کے علاوہ چالیر - نامروپ کھلدیا ہیں - انکے کارخانوں کی بھی استھتی اچھی نہیں ہے - جو بھی پیکیج بنائے جاتے ہیں اسکے لئے "گروپ آف منسٹرس" کی کمیٹی بھی بنائی گئی - لیکن ابھی تک گروپ آف منسٹرس نے کیا کیا - اسکی جانکاری ہم لوگوں کو نہیں ہے - جب پوچھا جاتا ہے تو کہا جاتا ہے کہ وہ گروپ آف منسٹرس کمیٹی میں وچار ادھین ہے - تو یہ کب تک وچار ادھین رہیگا - میں اس سلسلے میں یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ گورکھپور کے کھاد کارخانے سالوں سے بند پڑے ہیں اور اتر پردیش کے چناؤ سے پہلے مانیہ پردھان منتری جی نے یہ اعلان کیا تھا کہ گورکھپور کے کھاد کارخانوں کو چالو کیا جائیگا لیکن اس سلسلے میں ابھی تک کوئی کارگر قدم نہیں

سرکار کہتی ہے کہ "بنا رہے گا" آگے لکھا ہے کہ:

"سنیکت مورچہ سرکار سارو جنک اکشیتر کو مضبوط اور پرتی اسپردھا تمک بنانے میں مدد دے گی۔"

لیکن ہمارا کہنا ہے کہ اسکو مضبوط اور "پرتی اسپردھا تمک" بنانے میں وہ کامیاب ہو سکے۔ اسکے لئے کوئی طریقہ اب تک نہیں کیا گیا ہے۔ ہم "سنیکت مورچہ سرکار" اور مانیہ منتری جی سے کہنا چاہیں گے کہ اپنے دیش کو جنتا کے سامنے "سارو جنک اکشیتر" کو مضبوط بنانے اور "سفل پرتی یوگی" بنانے کیلئے جو آپنے "گھوشنا کی ہے اس "گھوشنا" کو آپ تہہ دل سے عمل میں لانے کی کوشش کیجئے۔ آگے اس میں کہا گیا ہے کہ:

غیر متھ پودن اور غیر راجنیک اکشیتروں سے سارو جنک اکشیتروں کی واپسی کے سوال پر ساودھانی سے وچار کیا جائے گا۔ لیکن مزدوروں اور کرمچاریوں کو روزگار کی سرکشا نشچت کی جائے گی یا متبادل کے روپ میں پنے ٹریننگ یا پنے نیکتی کا موقع فراہم کیا جائیگا۔"

تو میں مانتا ہوں کہ یہ سرکار کہہ سکتی ہے کہ "سارو جنیک اکشیتر" کی کچھ کمپنیاں اور کارخانہ "غیر متھ پودن" بن گئے ہیں اور انکو کام صحیح طریقہ سے نہیں چل سکتے ہیں۔ انھیں صحیح طریقہ سے انجام نہیں دیا جا سکتا۔

مھودیہ۔ میں نے پچھلے دنوں بولتے ہوئے بھی کہا تھا کہ ہمارے دیش کے وکاس کیلئے "تو نرمان کیلئے" اور ضروریات کو پورا کرنے کیلئے "سارو جنک اکشیتر" کی ایک اہم بھومیکا ہے۔ لیکن مجھے ایسا لگتا ہے کہ سرکار پچھلے کچھ سالوں سے جب سے "آرتھک اداری کرن کی نیتی" اپنائی گئی ہے "سارو جنک اکشیتر سے پرتی" اتنا دھیان نہیں دے رہی ہے جتنا کہ دیا جانا چاہئے تھا اور اس سمت میں جو صحیح حل نکالا جانا چاہئے تھا سرکار اسمیں پیچھے ہٹ رہی ہے جسکے کارن دنوں دن ہمارے پبلک سیکٹر کے کارخانے اور کمپنیاں بیمار ہوتی جا رہی ہیں۔ انکو بیماری سے نجات دلانے کیلئے جو مناسب اقدامات ہماری سرکار کو کرنے چاہئیں تھے سرکار نہیں کر پا رہی ہے۔ ہماری جو یہ "سنیکت مورچہ سرکار" ہے اسمیں "سارو جنک اکشیتر کی بھومیکا" کو اپنے کامن منیم پروگرام میں بھی درشایا ہے اور اسمیں لکھا ہے کہ:

وکاس کے پرار مبھیک دشکوں میں سارو جنک اکشیتر نے اگرنی بھومیکا ادا کی۔ سارو جنک اکشیتر بھارتیہ ادیوگ کا ایک مہتوپورن ستمبھ بنا رہے گا۔

ہیں انکو سرکار "پنر جیوت" نہیں کر سکتی ہے۔ اسلئے میں کہنا چاہونگا کہ اس دشا میں ٹھوس قدم سرکار کو اٹھانے چاہئیں اور اس سدن کو اور اس دیش کو بتانا چاہیئے کہ سرکار اس دشا میں کیا کرنے جا رہی ہے۔

مہودے۔ میں یہ بھی کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ صنعتی بیماری کے سمبندھ میں بھی سرکار نے کامن منیمم پروگرام میں کہا ہے کہ صنعتی بیماری کا سامنا کرنے کیلئے ایک نیا قانون بنایا جائے گا اور صنعتی اور مائی "پونر نرمان بورڈ" کا پوری طرح "پونر گھٹن" کیا جائیگا اور قانون میں چھوٹے اد یوگوں میں بیماری کا سامنا کرنے کیلئے ایک الگ "کارپوریٹ" کی ویوستھا کی جائیگی اور بیمار اد یوگوں کا "پونر واس" کرنے اور انھیں "پونر جیوت" کرنے کا پربندھ کیا جائے گا اور مزدوروں کے حقوق کی حفاظت کی جائیگی۔

مہودیہ۔ ابھی کل ہی ہم لوگوں نے ایک بل پاس کیا ہے۔ اسمیں بھی یہ اسپشٹ نہیں ہے کہ آئی۔ آر۔ بی۔ آئی۔ نو جو ہم نے ایک کمپنی میں بدل دیا ہے و کمپنی ان بیمار کارخانوں کیلئے کیا "پراودھان" کرے گی۔ اسکا اسمیں کوئی "اسپشٹ سنکیت"

وہ "سارو جنک اکشیتر" سے الگ کرنا چاہتے ہیں اور اسکے لئے کیا کوئی یوجنا ہے کیا آپنے اسکو پوائنٹ آؤٹ کیا ہے کہ کونسی یونٹس غیر ہتھ پورن ہو گئی ہے۔ ساتھ ہی ساتھ سرکار کا کہنا ہے کہ مزدوروں اور کرمچاریوں کا روزگار محفوظ رہے گا اور متبادل کے روپ میں انھیں دوبارہ ٹریننگ کیا جائیگا اور انکا دوبارہ روزگار دینے کا موقع دیا جائیگا۔ لیکن پچھلے دنوں میں دیکھا گیا ہے کہ "نو ورک نو پے" اسکیم کے تحت بہت سے مزدوروں کو وداع کر دیا گیا کچھ راشی دے کر۔ تو یہ جو انکی اسکیم ہے اگر وہ بھی چلتی رہے گی تو یہ ٹریننگ کب دینگے۔ انکو "پونر نیوکتی" کی گارنٹی کب دینگے۔

مہودیہ۔ اسلئے سے انکی "سوچھا سے سیوا نورت" ہونے کی جو یوجنا ہے اسکو یہ ابھی تک جاری رکھے ہوئے ہیں۔ اس سے آشنکا ہوتی ہے کہ "کامن منیمم پروگرام" میں یہ قبول کرتے ہیں۔ لیکن اسکو لاگو کرنے میں جس مضبوطی کے ساتھ آگے آنا چاہیئے اسکے لئے نہ تو یوجنا ہے اور نہ تو تیاری ہے۔ جبتک وشواس اور درڑ نشچے کے بھاؤ کے ساتھ اس دشا میں ہم آگے نہیں بڑھیں گے تب تک سارو جنک شیتر کی جو یہ بیمار اکائیاں

نہیں ہے۔ اسلئے ہم چاہینگے کہ سرکار اس
دشا میں "اسپیشٹ نیتی" بنائے اور اسکے
لئے ضروری پروگراموں کا اعلان کرے۔ ساتھ
ہی ساتھ جو ہمارے "سارو جنیک اکنشیز"
کے بیمار کارخانے ہیں انکے لئے سرکار ایک
ٹائم باؤنڈ پروگرام بنائے تاکہ صحیح معنوں
میں ہماری جو بیمار کمپنیاں اور کارخانے
ہیں انکو "پنروددار" یوجنا کے مادھیم سے
ٹھیک کیا جاسکے اور اتپادن کو بڑھایا جا
سکے اور ہم دیش میں بھی جنتا کی ضرورتوں
کو پورا کرسکیں اور ودیشوں میں بھی اپنے
مال کو بیچ کر کے ودیشی مدرا کما بھی "ارجن"
کر سکیں اور "گلوبل مارکیٹ" کی جو "آرتھک
نیتیاں" ہیں اسمیں اگر ہم اتپادن ہی نہیں
کر پائینگے تو نہ دواسے اکنشیز میں۔ نہ کمار
کے اکنشیز میں۔ نہ ٹیکسٹائل کے اکنشیز میں۔
تو یہ گلوبل میں انکی جو نیتی ہے اسمیں کونسا
رول اٹھا پائینگے۔

اسلئے ہم کہنا چاہینگے کہ دیش کے ہت
میں اور دیش کی جنتا کے ہت میں یہی
ہوگا کہ ایک "سپیشٹ نیتی" کے ساتھ
ٹھیک نیتی اور تہہ دل سے سرکار نے جو
وعدہ کیا ہے اسکو عملی جامہ پہنائیں۔

انھیں شبدوں کے ساتھ میں گرجی پرشاد جی
کے سنکلپ کا بھرپور سمرتھن کرتے ہوئے میں
اپنی بات سماپت کرتا ہوں۔ "ختم شد"

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Shri Triloki Nath Chaturvedi.

एक आपसे रिक्वेस्ट कर सकती हूं। डा० बी०बी० दत्त को शायद हॉस्पिटल में बहुत जरूरी जाना है। उन्होंने मुझे रिक्वेस्ट भेजी है कि मैं उन्हें पहले बुलवाऊं अगर आपकी कोई आपत्ति नहीं है।

SHRI TRILOK NATH CHATURVEDI: The reason he has given will have priority. he is an old friend.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): I appreciate that. Thank you.

DR. B.B. DUTTA (NOMINATED): Madam Chairperson, I would like to focus the attention of this august House on one particular aspect relating to this resolution and that is in regard to public sector. Those who are involved in framing policies should disabuse their minds of the confusion about the very concept and the role of public sector in the vast economy of India. Madam, if we are confused in our minds as to how to handle the public sector which is a very vast sector in India today, these how can we remove sickness? We must have very clear thinking in the changed circumstances; yes, circumstances have changed, and our thinking should not suffer from any kind of haziness. I am sorry to say that we find there is a lot of confusion, there is a lot of haziness in thinking about how to go about with the public sector. Madam, I would like to recall that since 1950s, starting with 1948, when out illustrious first Prime Minister of India gave shape to India's industrial policy, the public sector has played a tremendous role in building up the Indian economy. It has created basic and key industries. It has actually given shape to the industrial muscle of Indian economy. If anything is responsible today for putting the Indian economy on the world map as one of the eight or nine top industrial countries in the world, then it is the key role that the public sector has played in addressing itself to the commanding heights of the economy and in the key and basic sectors

of the industrial fields. That we should not forget. Madam, the public sector in India has embraced not only engineering and manufacturing sector but it has embraced the infrastructural sector it has embraced the service sector and in all these sectors it has built up a very beautiful base for the Indian economy, of which we should be proud today. We should not only think that there are so many sick units but we should go back to its history.

We have to look at the role played by the public sector in the earlier decades in giving shape to the Indian economy. Another thing is that when we compare public sector with private sector, we should not forget one cardinal point. That is, the public sector in India has a little more than four decades of history while the history of private sector runs into hundreds of years. What is the story of the private sector? It is a story of exploitation. It is a story of unemployment. It is a story of utter inefficiency and stagnation. It has gone through many phases. Today, we are going in for liberalisation, globalisation and privatisation. When we are going in for all these, we should not forget that all is not well with the private sector. It is not correct to create an impression that if the foreign companies come, if foreign multinationls come, everything will be all right. We should try to see things against this perspective.

These questions are very important today. But we must first make an assesment whether the Indian economy has reached a stage when it can be opened up fully. Can we say that our economy is capable of allowing anybody and into any sector? Can anybody start industries by ringing in his own money, his own expertise and his own know-how? Has our economy reached that stage? I agree with the point that today in India we have got thousands and thousands of enterpreneurs operating in every part of India. There may not be many in the North-East. they are there in other areas. We agree that it was not the same case in the '50s. So, the situation has changed. Today we have got a highly develope capital market. We did not have it at all at the beginning. Yes, the situation has changed and the private sector is able to play a much larger role. It is able to take a larger initiative and we should not deny that buoyancy to the economy the privates initiative can develop. At the same time, we should not also deny the role of the Public sector in creating that buoyancy and dynamism in the India economy. So, in the changed circumstances, I for one do not doubt that the role of the private sector, and for that matter the role of the State, has to change in accordance with the circumstances. There are changes all over the world. There have been tremendous changes in the socialist countries. There is a dramatic experiment going on in the socialist China today. We have to take note of everything and we have to redefine the role of the public sector as well as the role of the State. But I think that the situation is such that we cannot open up every area, every sector of our economy indiscriminately and say that it is open to competition. Competition is welcome. This is the key word today. Efficiency is required. Productivity must go up. Private initiative should not be kept captive. It should be released so that the private entrepreneurs, those who are coming up, have an open field to play from the Indian side. We don't deny all these things. But keeping all these things in mind, I believe that the public sector in India still has a tremendous role to play. What is the reason behind the sickness that has overwhelmed our public sector? Is it because something is inherently or theoretically wrong with the public sector units or with some exterprises in the public sector? There is nothing. It is wrong at the management level. We have failed to give ourselves a management cadre. We have not entrusted the responsibility of the public sector to those people who are trained in economics, trade and commerce. We have not given them the full autonomy to run their units, to produce quality goods, to earn necessary profits and to generate necessary sur-

pluses. We have not done that. They have suffered from unimaginative and unproductive interference from the Government and from the bureaucracy. These are the things, these are the main factors responsible for making the public sector sick. And you declare the public sector as bad. This is a very wrong conclusion. Today we are spreading an idea throught the length and breadth of this country, we are trying to implant in the minds of the common people that if the private sector dominates if the multinationals come, everything will be all right.

3.00 P.M.

If we go in this fashion, Madam, then I am afraid that we will be heading towards the worst kind of disaster. We want to be competitive. We want to open our economy. We want to liberalise. We are not against globalisation. We have to play our part as one of the members of the comity of nations. But the question is this. We have to be very, very careful. That is why I say that our policy makers, our decision makers and those who are at the helm of affairs should make a thorough assessment as to what role the State should play. Whould the State act as only a regulator of the economy? Should the State go on producing certain goods or should it be only be a welfare State producing only selective goods? If you categorise goods and services, these are the basic questions. Or, should the State take a more positive role in certain key and basic sectors? Those questions remain to be answered.

Madam, there are very important public enterprises. These may be related to defence. These may be related to production of certain key items, sensitive items for the economy. The State should spell out its policies. After we open up our economy if we find that some units in the private sector are not behaving properly and that things are going from bad to worse in private sector, should the State never intervene? The State must have this power so that if intervention is required, intervention must be made.

If the State has to play the role of umpire, what is the harm? The umpire has to blow the whistle when things go wrong, when things go against the interest of the economy, when things go against the interest of the common man because even today millions of our people are poor, millions of them have to be brought above the poverty line. Can we let things go like this? Can we allow our production areas, our theatres of production and markets to be invaded by all sorts of influences from outside? Madam, I feel that we have to have very open debate on this. The entire nation must engage itself in this debate and try to see things in the right perpective. This is my humble submission. Because these things are not yet clear, some people think that the entire economy should be opened up and they think that we are suffering because we are not opening up. But at the same time they also have a hesitation that if we open up, they do not know what will happen. Then because of this hesitation, we again go on suffering. So, we neither go forward nor go backward. We do not know where we are going. This debate must come to an end and a clear-cut policy must be spelt out before the nation. We are in a mess today and we must make ourselves clear on our economic policy and our industrial policy and we must enact some laws so as to enable us to secure participation of foreign investors and participation of multinationals in certain fields like infrastructure and other areas.

Madam, I said that I wanted to make only one point clear. I would not like to take much time of the House by repeating all sorts of statistics about sickness in industry, the Common Minimum Programme, etc. All I want to say is, let us be clear conceptually. Let us be very, very clear at the policy level. Let us be very, very clear whether or not the public sector has a role to play in the development of our resurgent economy.

Let us be clear what role the state should play.

With these few words, Madam, I conclude. Thank you, very much.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Thank you Dr. Dutta. Shri Triloki Nath Chaturvedi.

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI (Uttar Pradesh): Thank you, Madam Chairperson. I rise in support of the resolution that has been moved by my friend, Shri N. Giri Prasad.

Madam, this is a very important matter. We have been dealing with this matter in an absolutely ritualistic manner.

Otherwise, there would not have been a need for this resolution. Even In this short spell of four years in this House, I recall that a number of questions have been put about this particular matter. Hon. Members will recall a number of discussions and replies given by different Ministers at different points of time, and all at variance one way or the other, saying that the matter is pending at level 'A' or level 'B' or in the ministry 'C' or in the Ministry 'D'. The coherence of the Government's policy and its implementation always showed the Achilles' heel of this entire thing. That is why this resolution has come again. It is a reflection of the lack of seriousness with which this House and the Government has dealt with this issue all along.

Madam Vice-Chairperson, the hon. Minister while replying to a question had very rightly used the metaphor of yellow light or amber light or red light or green light and then the question of ambiguity in our approach. If it is true of any situation, then it is true in respect of our policy towards the public sector. While the Indian economy is supposed to be at the cross-roads, we don't know in which direction to proceed. This is in spite of this Common Minimum Programme of the present Government. This is a matter which is really above the battle of politics. To me, it is a matter of national interest and I will say that it is a policy matter which has been the part of our economic thinking and our economic system all along. It has implications in the present and it will have much greater consequences for the economic future of this country. That is why it has been very rightly said by my friend, Dr. B.B. Dutta that the role of the public sector—not only the role of the public sector, but the role of the State and the Government that you visualise and which is reflected or which you think is in conformity with the Common Minimum Programme that you have formulated—should be placed before this House as to how far you want to go. The role as well as the relevance. It is not just a question in terms of the role of the State. Yes, as a producer of goods and services for reason of equity or for any other reason that you may have, how far you want your Government to go as a regulator of economic activities? How far you view the State or the Government as a facilitator through the provision of infrastructure and public goods? How far you look at the State and the Government as a promoter of the economic activity in this country or, as was said, the welfare activity? Unfortunately, the word 'welfare' and 'equity' somehow or the other are of a discounte in the discussion. I think that is a very important matter. I don't want to go into much of the historical background, but I would certainly like to remind this House about one or two things. The public enterprises have all along been considered as the prime mover or the principal instruments for the economic development in all the under-developed economies, including India. Even in the United Nations Report in 1951, which had economists like Arthur Louis and one of our own economists of whom we are proud, Prof. B.R. Gadgil, as its members is still probably a textbook in many of our schools and colleges today. I would also like to remind this House, through you, Madam Vice-Chairperson, that if we look at the writings of Mahadev Govind Ranade or Romesh Chandra Dutt's

'Economic History of India' or if we look at Dadabhai Nauroji's wirtings and his book, we will know as to what kind of a role they had visualised for the State.

Not only that, we paid homage to Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose some time back. He set up the National Planning Committee and Pt. Nehru was the Chairman of this Committee. This was prior to Independence, I think, in 1937-38. They gave various reports and membership of these committees transcended the spectrum of different political opinions for various reasons. What was the kind of role outlined by it? I was a college student of B.A. 1st year when the so-called Tata-Birla Plan came. It was known as Tata-Birla Plan as such. Its real name was Bombay Plan. What role? Nothing to do with ideology! Even that Plan set two things, namely, role for planning and the activist role of the State with regard to the public sector and public enterprises. I just want to remind that this is a national problem and it has nothing to do with ideology. I do not carry any ideological bagage or any prepossession in this respect. What is the national interest? There is no dichotomy between the public sector and the private sector. Both have to merge, subserve and support the national sector. I would like to remind that Pt. Nehru is very often mentioned when we talk about planning and the role of the public sector. It is a very dismal story that from the so-called commanding heighths of economy we have descended to the present position of disinvestment which is often an euphemism for privatisation. I have nothing against privatisation if it is in the national interest, as has rightly been mentioned by Dr. Dutta. But has there been a proper, coherent and sustained thinking on this? or is it just an *ad hoc* remedy to an evil which has just come to our notice? Sir, I would like to say that when we compare ourselves and the role of our State with other countries, we should not forget that the role of our State was in a democratic framework. We compare ourselves with Asian Tigers, different stages, or even with post McArther era in Japan. I do not want to go into all these details. Madam, I would very humbly and respectfully say that, after all, the '50s were the hey days for the public sector—rightly so—in the hope that they would constitute a springboard for the next stage of development of the country. Why was it so? There were cases of misenterprise. The private sector as existed then and even assisted by the Government did not enter in many fields for a number of reasons. These reasons might be lumpy investment, long gestation period, delayed returns and other financial expenditures which were beyond the reach of the private sector parties. Therefore, the idea which Pt. Nehru advanced and to which we all agree, was that limited resources should be utilised to the best advantage, is, in the totality of the economy. That was an idea to build a spirit of self-reliance. I will quote later on the Industrial Policy Resolution of 1991 and how it contrasted with the Resolution 1956 and a few others which came later on. We will find what shadow just crossed between the promise or the assurance and performance and what is being achieved or is really being attempted to. I will also mention that it is unfortunate that a number of things happen and I will mention only two particular things which I always hear and which have just been mentioned by Dr. Dutta and due to time constraint he wanted to dilate only on one thing. I would like to say that two things are mentioned: one is the question of industrial management. The management was not up to the mark. Who was responsible for this management? Was it not the Government? It is not a question of whether this Government or that Government, or the bureaucrats—IAS or IFS or Audit and Accounts—whoever they may be. Who was responsible for it? Did you not also set up the Indian Management Cadre? Why did you wind it up? If there were deficiencies in it, what did you do to rectify those mistakes and improve that cadre? Who has been responsible? Not for months but for two or three years

some public sector units were headless and topless. Who is responsible? Who has been responsible? Somehow or the other, the Public Enterprises Selection Board being so pliable, they await your nod before they make their recommendations. Who is responsible, when they make their recommendation and for years together the files go on from one Ministry to the other, they just hatch themselves in the Prime Minister's Office? Who is responsible?

The other point is about technology. Who is responsible for this? Not the Government? Not the Government's policy? Not the follow-up of that policy by the Government? Who else? All this is in the thin air. Then, you take technology upgradation. Who is responsible? Modernisation of technology—what have we done over the years? What has the Government done? Did it take heed of it? These are the bugbears which are always brought about from time to time. They say, such and such is responsible in the globalised world where we have to compete, etc. Nobody disputes that we have to compete. There were certain criteria in the 50s in the 60s. And in the 70s a lot of trouble arose. I do not want to go at length into it but I just would like to point out one or two things. One is the idea of bringing them up as the temples of modern India occupying the commanding heights, etc. We took up the question of industrial sickness. The views of the private sector were taken. Whose decision was that? Was it not of the Government? Why did you lump them up with the public sector? Why did you not attend to the evils and address yourself, separately to these industrial private sector units? And their sickness you should attribute to the weakness of the public sector subsequently. Yes, there were difficulties in the public sector also. Why did you not address yourself, separately to those ailments and the maladies of the public sector rather than lump up the two? What did we do to the private sector which was responsible for this? I know, I mean, the Finance Minister says that the group approach cannot be applied. You do not want to apply anything harsh even the erring public sector people. They may appropriate or misappropriate at one time, by one hand, but then you say the other hand is clean, the other units is good; so why should we penalise it? Is this the correct approach? Is this the kind of vision that we have for the public sector? Then we went to many consumer industries. What for? Is it to expand the empire of the various Ministries, to provide fresh pastures for the Ministers? And, now you want to wind them up! We know how many of these public sector units have been exploited and even bled white by this kind of a situation. There is no point in going into all these reports of the Committees on Public Undertakings and so on and so forth. Even the Comptroller and Auditor General brings that out very vividly from time to time and we discuss them even in this House. This is the kind of situation. So, for our own acts of omission and commission, we just try to find scapegoats elsewhere.

If things are done in a wrong way—we extend the public sector without caring as to what was our core, what was our aim, initially which must sustain the later development of the public sector—we should correct them now; we should take proper care of it. What were heavy engineering industries, what were fertilizer industries, we did not know, when we were students, that chemical industries such as Sindri, were the pride of our country. Chemical industries coming up—nothing like that existed. Then the scenario changed and we went into the question of bread and butter. I am not interested in all that. The question is about our priorities. Somehow or other they have become awry. Now the situation has become much worse. So, the rationale and the considerations are very important. I also do not want to go into the figures of industrial sickness. The hon'ble Minister, who is a very knowledgeable, a very well-meaning person, and whom I found to be a good friend,

has given us the correct situation, as he views it from time to time. The public sector units, which were only five in 1951, became 245 in 1993, as my figures show. Now there is a wide spectrum, a wide variety of functions—infrastructural, commercial, service industry, manufacturing industry and so on. We cannot have same kind of remedy for the variety of situations and for the variety of these units. We will have to take into account the specific nature of the problem. These kind of things no Ministry has ever gone into. Now, if a Ministry, particularly the Ministry of Mr. Maran, goes into it, they will say, what can we do, we are looking towards the Finance Ministry. Now, this is the question. I do not want to go into the details of the BIFR. What happens to the BIFR? Goswami Committee gave certain report. One or two recommendations were accepted, and the House is yet to know what ultimately is the outcome. The full picture of it is still not clear to us. The BIFR has many a time complained that the full complement of the Members is not there, whatever their set-up. Do we address ourselves urgently to this kind of a situation? And then the BIFR. What is the status of the recommendation of the BIFR? First it is a legal judicial kind of a process. It is supposed to expedite matters. But, it takes time. I do not mind. I also do not want to say that you have put bureaucrats in it. But, the real thing is: Have you cared to place your case before the BIFR in the proper spirit of re-structuring and reinforcing the public sector? Are you hoping that sheer delay or dialotoriness on your part, it will get dismantled and you will get an adverse report from them? And the BIFR gives its report. And on whom is the report of the BIFR binding? Is it binding on the Government, even if this Government or any Government for that matter, is a cohesive whole? I don't want to pass any remarks on that. No politics is involved in this. If it is binding on Mr. Maran's Ministry, is it binding on the others? If it is binding on the Textile Ministry, then the Textile Minister will way, this has been again reffered to the Finance Ministry. On whom are the recommendations and the report of the BIFR binding and whom are we really going to deceive so far as this matter is concerned? I do not want to go into the details by quoting the earlier figures of investment. I only give the later figure. I am deliberately doing it. In 1993, this figure went up to Rs. 1,46,971 crores. This is as per the Public Enterprises Survey of that particular year.

Madam, may I know, through you, from the Government as to why this Public Enterprises Survey is not being placed on the Table of the House and circulated to the Memebrs this year? Yet, we are going to discuss the Budget! In spite of this, we are going to discuss the Budget. I am saying this from my experience of four years. That is why I am quoting this figure deliberately. I have got, from other sources, the later figures.

The question is: is it not a reflection on the alleged seriousness, or, commitment on the part of this Government to the public sector? Is it transparency? Is it accountability? Do you want to keep this august House completely in the dark, about which my friend, Mr. Ansari, was just now lamenting? This is the position. Still, we are going to discuss the Budget! I though, perhaps, by today, it would be distributed to us; it would be made available to us. We do not know what is the position. Who is responsible for it? We are not aware.

As I said, with a homogenised approach to these variegated and diversified aspects, a full assessment of the nature of the public sector is not possible. There is, therefore, a need for a choesive and coordinated approach, as I mentioned. I will make one or two suggestions in this regard.

The other thing I want to mention before this august Hosue, Madam Vice-Chairperson, is that, we want to discuss only the Central sector projects or units. But there are also the State sector projects. It is not just a question of U.P. It is

not because UP is under President's rule and that, therefore, the question was raised from all sides of the House. Take, for example, Uptron. For the last seven months, workers are not getting anything. Even in regard to the Central sector units, the same kind of complaints have been voiced, have been articulated, from time to time, by my friends opposite. In the case of the present state of affairs in Uptron, who is responsible for it? Don't you think that something needs to be done in this case?

The point I am emphasising here is that the State sector is equally important, for the simple reason that it has also an impact, adverse or otherwise, on the whole economy of the country. It is not that you can isolate the Central sector from the State sector. Anyway, I do not want to dilate more on this point.

I would also like to know whether the Government—when they are talking about the sickness or the question of disinvestment in the public sector has tried to study the symbiotic relationship that exists between the private and the public sector, which was envisaged earlier. The public sector produced goods which go as input into the private sector industries. The public sector produces infrastructure which is utilised by the private sector. Therefore, when the public sector is sick, the private sector also suffers. Who has gained? How has the private sector thrived over the years? As I said, there is no indeological preposition in favour of either the public or the private sector, so far as I am concerned. The point is, the inefficiency of the public sector tells upon the inefficiency of the private sector. That is why we had the concept of mixed economy. But we have how made it into a mixed-up economy. It is neither fish nor fowl. This is the kind of situation in which we find ourselves today. Neither there is allocative efficiency, in the interest of social equity, nor is there the so-called efficiency of market allocation.

Madam Vice-Chairperson, I again emphasise this particular point. I would like to further mention that not only the Public Enterprises Survey has been placed before us. There is also another thing. Every time, when I hear the hon. Minister replying to questions, I find that there is no co-ordination, either vertical or horizontal, between the various Ministries, as regards the public sector units under individual Ministry. That is what is important. That has created the entire confusion with the Government and also among others. It is because there is no focal point. We set up the Department of Public Enterprises in the hope that it will be able to ensure some coordination, vertical and horizontal, to serve the common policy. I am not saying that coordination is not an attempt at subordinating others. Then it became a Ministry. We set up the Ministry of Programme Implementation also. But, what has the Ministry of Programme Implementation done? We have not received the Annual Reports also this year.

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI MURASOLI MARAN): Excuse me. The Annual Report of the Department of Public Enterprises was laid on the Table of the House only on 19-7-1996. I think, for this year, it is getting ready by 31-3-1997. It will be laid on the Table of the House by April, 1997.

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: Thank you, Sir, for this information. Normally, we get it for the Budget Session. You agree with this. When you were on this side of the House, you always said that it was of great help to us when we discussed the Budget. But, anyway, the information that you have given is also quite encouraging at least for the future.

About the Ministry of Programme Implementation, why has a particular unit got cost overruns? I do not know what is done. We are aware of what happens. Of course, the SCOPE which is, in a way, Government supported and Government-sponsored, has a big building. The poor fellows are trying to do something about the public sector. Some time ago, I remember, they organised a good confer

ence. I could not attend it, but they sent a report to me on that. What has the Government done? Everybody who took part in that conference organised by the SCOPE, is not from the Opposition like me, but they are serving managing directors and Chairman of public sector units and experts who had earlier headed these organisations. What happens to the report? Again, it is just thrown into the waste-paper basket or it goes into *basta-e-khamoshi.* We do not know what happens to it.

Madam Vice-Chairman, I would also like to mention one of the saddest things. As I said earlier also, the piecemeal initiatives, *ad-hoc* remedies, have just landed us into trouble. Disenchentment has set in. To illustrate this, I will just make a very brief reference to some of the reports presented from time to time.

There is the Fazal Committee Report. I do not want to go into many others. There is the Administrative Reforms Commission Report. There was a lot of change in the auditing processes and auditing procedures after the Administrative Reforms Commission Report came. But things did not improve in the public sector. There was a commission headed by Mr. Morarji Desai. I think that another one was headed by the former Prime Minister, Mr. Chandra Shekhar. If I remember aright, he headed a team on the study of the public sector. Finally, there was the report of the commission headed by Mr. Morarji Desai. We have landed ourselves in this situation. There are reports of the Committees Commissions. This is what we hear when questions are answered. Sometimes the so-called clarifications are also given. That is why, Madam, I will just very briefly refer to some of the reports without going into their details.

First, I will like to refer to the L.K. Jha Economic Administrative Reforms Commission. I do not want to go into the administrative thing. Though I was not in the Finance Ministry or any other economic Ministry, he had called me for two or three days. I do not want to waste the time of the House because it is all known. I would just like to highlight some of the points of the Commission. One is: "Analysis of PEs in the Public enterprises survey. inlcuding both profit-making and the loss-making enterprises... The analysis of the latter should indicate the factors responsible for the loss in various category sectors etc." Has this been done? If action to rectify it had been taken, even the hon Minister would agree it would have set the situation right at the proper time.

There is a point about clearances and approvals. Fortunately some liberalisation in this has been made. That is, of course, nominal. We can take it up at the time we discuss the Budget.

A mention was also made of the pricing policy. What was done about this?

Then there was the Arjun Sen Gupta Committee. That Committee has also come to meet me as the Comptoller and Auditor General at that point of time. It has made a number of recommendations. Very few of them were accepted. We do not know the fate of others. One of the recommendations was about the holding companies. Even Mr. Kumaramangalam, at one time, had propagated it and many felt that that might help. Now, what has happend to the concept of holding companies? Did you take the House into confidence as to what was your experience and why this concept is not holding good, then there is the question of memorandum of understanding. We have been hearing about it, but some of the companies are just on the decline. What has happened to it and what is your experience? Here also you are doing the back-seat driving. What exactly is the position? The House must be taken into confidence.

Then there are recommendations of the Economic Advisory Council of the Prime Minister. Late Sukhomoy Chakraborty was the Chairman of this Council. I would only read one or two sentences on the financial profitability. "The financial

profitability of PEs is influenced by a variety of factors. In order to prove performance, the specific constraints faced by the PEs have to be identified and appropriate solutions found. Some of these solutions may be sector specific, while some may be interprise-specific." A detailed analysis of some of these problems is in the selected sectors like coal, steel and fertilisers available in the Fazal Committee Report. But, nothing has happened thereafter. The Sengupta Committee and even this Committee will illustrate my point. Who is responsible? If not the Government, is the public sector responsible? This is the example. "Inappropriate locations, improper technology in surgical for instrument plants of the I.D.P.L...." Who is responsible for that improper technology at that point of time? Then labour, irrational product-mix in the Salem Steel Plant. Then imposed market arrangement -- please mark the word "imposed" -- arrangements in the Kudremukh Iron Project. I do not want to go into the details. Why should these public enterprises be blamed? Moreover, there is such a dichotomy between what is promised and what is really being done. this is the statement of the Industrial Policy of 1991. As far as I know there is no comprehensive, substitute for this policy statement. It is unfortunate, after paying homage to Jawaharlal Nehru in the first instance, they used even this word, -- I wish it had been avoided—"After the initial 'exuberance' of the public sector..."..." Was it a wedding festivity? The Government used the word "exuberance" of the public sector. I wish it had also been avoided.

That is not my point. The real thing is policy direction. The Government is pledged to launching a reinvigorated struggle for social and economic justice, to end poverty and unemployment and to build a modern, democratic, socialist, prosperous and forward-looking India. While Government will continue to follow the policy of self-reliance, there would be greater emphasis placed on building up our ability to pay for imports through our own foreign exchange earnings. How hollow this claim has been was exposed by Mr. Ansari. What I really want to bring to the notice of the House is important. I quote:

> "The Government will ensure that the public sector plays its rightful role in the evolving socio-economic scenario of the country. The Government will ensure that the public sector is run on business lines as envisaged in the Industrial policy Resolution of 1956." There is a reference to the Resolution of the Nehru also—"and would continue to innovate and lead in strategic areas of national importance. In the 1950s and 1960s, the principal instrument for controlling the commanding heights of the economy was investment in the capital of key industries. Today the State has other instruments of intervention particularly fiscal and monetary instruments." Yesterday, the Industrial Reconstruction Bank has been liquidated. "The State also commands the bulk of nation's savings. Banks and financial institutions are under State control." Are they? Do you stand by it? Then, I think Mr. Dipankar Mukherjee would feel happy about it. We know what came out of the Joint Parliamentary Committee's report. "Where State intervention is necessary these instruments will prove more effective and decisive."

Then, he goes on to say, I quote:

> "The Government will fully protect the interests of labour, enhance their welfare and equip them in all respects to deal with the inevitablity of technological change."

What has happened to the exist policy? It was enforced both in the public sector and the private sector. What has happened to the golden handshake scheme? Who have been benefited under

the golden handshake scheme? Only those people have availed of this scheme who were in great demand in multinational companies and the private sector. I am sorry to say that only the second category of people have been left behind. What is the kind of situation that we are now in?

Madam, I do not want to take more time of the House by mentioning too many things. I would just draw the attention of the House to two or three things and then I am done. So far as my own proclivity as well as the policy of my party towards the so-called restructuring and disinvestment are concerned, we have made our point very clear. The then Finance Minister, Shri Manmohan Singh invited our party to present our views. Just before our delegation, Shri Indrajit Gupta led his own party to represent their view-point. Our party has emphasised a few things. One was about the Disinvestment Commission. Of course, there is a dispute about the Disinvestment Commission as to whether it should be a Standing Committee—as suggested by Mr. Rangarajan—or it should be a trust. But our policy was that revaluation of shares must be done. Similarly, the assets also.

SHRI SURINDER KUMAR SINGLA: Was it your policy?

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: It was our policy. Mr. Singla, we don't change that policy frequently. So far as I am concerned, I have been your friend since a long time and I don't think that I would be diverted from what I have to say.

So far as disinvestment of shares in the public sector undertakings like the SAIL is concerned, there should be transparency. If the SAIL has to become a private sector, there should be transparency. If the technologists and workers want to form a cooperative, then, the first priority should be given to them in taking up this particular matter. This is what we have said. We have also mentioned about redeployment and training of the labour. We cannot leave them in the lurch by announcing hurriedly about the exist policy and the golden handshake scheme and so on. It is not a question of labour. But it is the technological strength which has been built over the years. I would like to mentioned that there have been spill-over effects of the public sector... of the public sector, IIMS, Administrative Staff College, Indian Institutes of Technology. For whom were they built? Anybody who attended the National Development Council meeting at that point of time will recall. For whom were these institutions set up? So many sociological studies, economic studies, evaluation organisations were set up. But, unfortunately, we have completely thrown away their recommendations.

Now, I was talking about the Disinvestment Commission. Here also, I think, a number of times, this has happened. The Rangarajan Committee was set up. When? It was set up after a CAG report about disinvestment. Again, there was ad-hocism when the Public Enterprises Board had taken up the work. My friends now supporting or sitting in the Government were so vocal and critical about the whole thing. But it is immaterial. The fact remains that the loss occurred. It was referred to, a number of times, by my leader in this House. Also, the report of the Public Accounts Committee thereafter confirmed it. Then only there was the Rangarajan Committee. The only thing that gives a little bit of satisfying picture is that at least the Minister of Industry did mention last time that he was trying to evolve a much more integrated policy. But still, my point remains. The Disinvestment Commission itself is not satisfied. I do not want to go into any detail about the way you are handing them over at this particular moment. We know the statements he made only recently at different places and in public fora. Even these 'navaratnas' in the Budget, I do not know whether they will

achieve. We will talk about this when the occasion comes.

Now, at the end, I would like to request my hon. friend Mr. Murasoli Maran that a cohesive, coherent and long-sustained policy must be worked out and for that purpose, I would like to make four demands of the Government. In the first place, they must provide a white-paper outlining the different stages of their policy in this regard. What recommendations did they accept? They might be in a telegraphic form. But what recommendations did they accept? And which recommendations did they not accept and why? He should also give the position as regards the exit policy and labour development and all the assurances that have been given to us from time to time.

Secondly, I would like to request this Government that they should call a round-table conference. I want a round-table conference because I see at least a half circle here. In this, trade-unionists, representatives of political parties, industrialists and experts should be invited. You must evolve a basic minimum consensus. You have the Common Minimum Programme. But then, one of your earliest calls, even the health insurance sector, is a betrayal. It is not a political issue for me. It is a question of the economic destiny, the economic vision, the economic future, of this country and not the fleeting politics and the existencies of the moment. You decide what the criterion is. You are not even able to decide how the trade union elections should be held-by voting and in any confidential manner and so on. But let the Government at least call these people and let a minimum consensus be evolved. And if others deviate, it is all right. You have to take the decision. You are in power; you are the Government.

The demand is this. I hinted earlier also. You must also call a conference of the State Chief Ministers or the State Enterprises Ministers.

You had called the State Electricity Boards. Very often, we read in the newspapers about it. But the Electricity Boards do not cover the entire private sector. As a matter of fact, the infrastructure is very important. As the Comptroller and Auditor General of India, I had given a compendium to the Government in which I had summed up ten, fifteen years experience, because the Seventh Plan was in the offing, so that the Government might learn from it. But nothing happened. That compendium never came before the House. You cannot view the economy in isolation. you will borrow or the States will borrow and the inflation will be stepped up. Inefficiency, whether in the State sector or in the Central sector will affect the common people of this country. You can do it. The Prime Minister has been saying almost every day that the coalition Government is the Government of the States and it is for the States. For the first time, they have formed the Government at the Centre. So, the writ of the Central Government must run in the States and their hopes and aspirations must be considered and fulfilled by you. That is why if you really want to help the economy and if you really want to help the public sector, then please call them.

Lastely, I would like to submit that thereafter they should frame an action plan. That is their responsibility because they are the respository of power. Whether we may agree or may not agree, that is not the point. Whatever consensus is achieved, thereafter, they have to draw an action plan and the plan, as I have already said, should be industry-specific, should be department-specific, and the Ministry of Finance should not pose an obstacle. After all, there is a collective responsibility and the cohesiveness of the Government cannot be questioned. This is not for the hon. Minister. But since I read in the newspaper this morning that a satellite yagya is going on somewhere in the country to redeem a particular Chief Minister from some of the difficulties in which he has landed himself, so, if the

Government cannot do anything else, at least, with the blessings of the Leftist friends, they should organise a satellite yagya for the resumption of the public sector. But I am saying this not in a spirit of levity. But I am saying this with utmost sincerity and with all the emphasis at my command that this is a matter which merits the attention of the entire House and I hope Mr. Maran—I know he is handicapped in a number of ways, but he is a very witty person—will ensure that real justice is done to the public sector in the country, not because of ideological reasons, but for the future good of this country. Thank you.

श्री नरेश यादव (बिहार): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदया, मैं श्री एन० गिरि प्रसाद द्वारा लाए गए संकल्प का समर्थन करता हूं। आज देश में तीन सेक्टर्स हैं, प्राइवेट, कोऑपरेटिव और पब्लिक। पूरे देश में हम देख रहे हैं कि प्राइवेट और कोऑपरेटिवन सेक्टर्स सफल हो रहे हैं लेकिन जो पब्लिक सेक्टर इंडस्ट्री है, वह बीमार हो रही है और उसे हम छोड़ रहे हैं। संयुक्त मोर्चा की सरकार ने अपने न्यूनतम साझा कार्यक्रम में इस बात को दर्शाया है कि जो बीमार उद्योग हैं, उनके साथ सरकार सहयोग करेगी, उनका समर्थन करेगी, उन्हें एसिस्ट करेगी जिससे कि उनका संचालन पुनः हो सके। निश्चित तौर से किसी भी समाजवादी सरकार का सार्वजनिक उद्योगों को प्रोत्साहित करना सबसे पहला काम होता है।

अगर हम आज प्राइवेट उद्योग को प्रोत्साहन दें तो जो लाभ होता है वह व्यक्ति की जेब में चला जाता है और अगर हम सार्वजनिक उद्योग का समर्थन करते हैं, उसको प्रोत्साहन देते हैं और उसका सफल संचालन होता है, सही उत्पादन होता है तो उसका लाभ मजदूर और सरकार को सीधा जाता है। इसलिए चूंकि मैं खुद जिस राज्य और जिले से आता हूं, आज हमारे उस कटिहार जिले में बिहार में दो-दो जूट मिलें है जो रुग्ण है और आज वह घाटे में चल रही है, बंद पड़ी हुई है। मैं अपनी संयुक्त मोर्चा सरकार से आग्रह करना चाहूंगा, माननीय उद्योग मंत्री जी से आग्रह करना चाहूंगा कि जूट गांव में पैदा होता है, जूट की और जूट के बने हुए सामान की मांग भी काफी बढ़ी है, इसलिए कटिहार जूट मिल को अविलम्ब आर्थिक सहयोग देकर वहां नयी मशीनें लगाकर इसे फिर से चालू किया जाए। जो मजदूर आज सड़क पर भीख मांगने को मजबूर हैं, पिछले सात-आठ वर्षों से पुनर्जीवित होने की आशा में उनमें से कितने ही स्वर्ग सिधार गये, दुनिया में नहीं रहे। तो मेरा आग्रह है कि उनके सामने जो भुखमरी की समस्या है, बेकारी की समस्या है, बेरोजगारी की समस्या है उसको दूर किया जाए और सरकार उचित आर्थिक सहयोग देकर उस रुग्ण जूट मिल को फिर से चालू करवाए। महोदया, हमारी सरकार की भी यही नीति रही है, संयुक्त मोर्चा सरकार की यही नीति रही है। आज हम आपको यह बताना चाहते हैं, यह आग्रह करते हैं कि विदेशों से कितनी कम्पनियां आकर, विदेशों से इंडस्ट्रीयलिस्ट आकर के हमारे देश में उद्योग लगा रहे हैं, यह प्रक्रिया अच्छी नहीं है। हम यह चाहते हैं कि टैक्नॉलॉजी हम दुनिया लें लेकिन उद्योग हम अपने से स्वयं स्थापित करें। अपने देश में बहुत सारे लोग हैं जो आज इंडस्ट्री लगाने को तैयार हैं। जो हमारी भूख है, जो हमारी लिप्सा है कि विदेशों से आकर वह यहां उद्योग लगाएं, इस लिप्सा को हमें छोड़ना चाहिए, इस भूख को हमें त्यागना चाहिये और फिर से ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिये कि पूरे देश में विदेशियों का जाल बिछ जाए, इंडस्ट्रीज का जाल बिछ जाए और फिर से हम ईस्ट इंडिया कम्पनी की ओर चले जाएं, इस बात का भी खतरा इस देश में है। इसलिए हम चाहेंगे और हमारी पार्टी की मान्यता है कि पब्लिक सैक्टर को मज़बूत किया जाए, सार्वजनिक उद्योगों को हम मजबूत करें, आगे बढ़ायें। इसलिए जो हमारे साथी संकल्प लाए हैं, इस माध्यम से हम माननीय मंत्री जी का ध्यान इस बात की ओर लाना चाहते हैं कि आज समाजवाद का जमाना है, जमाना साम्यवाद का है। ऐसा न हो जाए कि जिस व्यवस्था को बहुत मुश्किल से हम लोग समाजवादी समाज के निर्माण के लिए लाए हैं, पूंजीवादी व्यवस्था को लाकर और पूरे उद्योग को हम एक व्यक्ति के हाथ में स्थापित कर दें। इसलिए मैं इस संकल्प का समर्थन करता हूं। आपने मुझे समय दिया, इसके लिए आपका बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE (WEST BENGAL): Madam, while supporting this Resolution, I am quite aware and I am sure that the whole House, including the hon. Minister himself-since he is equally concerned—expresses its serious concern about the growing sickness in a large number of public sector undertakings. From the macro level my esteemed colleagues Shri Chaturvedi and Dr. Dutta have been covering—I crave your indulgence if I draw a personal note; I started my career by working as an engineer in a British Company, Martin Burn, a powerhouse in Jabalpur; then I

went to Andrew Yule. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SURINDER KUMAR SINGLA: That was a public sector concern.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: At that time it was not a public sector concern. It was a British concern, a private concern.

Today if you look at that power-house in Jabalpur, it is non-existent. I mean it is not giving power. Andrew Yule power-house where I worked later is also not working. Then I joined BHEL, Bharat Heavy Electricals Ltd., at Bhopal. I remember, either at the end of 1970 or in the beginning of 1971, Mr. Mainul Haq Chowdhury who was the then Industry Minister had come to Bhopal and addressed the engineers and workers saying, "If the Heavy Electricals Bhopal—at that time it was not BHEL; it was Heavy Electricals Bhopal—works like this on losses, I will put a big lock". In those days the BHEL at Tiruchi was blooming. Our hon. Minister belongs to Tiruchi. We failed to learn lessons from them. Today, where is BHEL? Where is Martin Burn? Whre is Andrew Yule? the whole concept of sickness in the Indian context, I am sure, will create a lot of confusion here as if sickness is a public sector phenomenon or sickness is a private sector phenomenon. It is not that. The question is sickness. The question is not whether the ownership is private or public. The question is the concern of the Government. When the Sick Industrial Companies Act (SICA) was passed, was it for the public sector? For whose benefit was this Act passed? This Act was passed in this House to deal with the increasing sickness in the private sector. Today where do we stand? Has the sickness in the private sector decreased? No. Today it was three lakh units. Yesterday in this House we discussed it. It is four lakh units. Sickness is a problem which ails the Indian industry as a whole and, as it is, it concerns the Government and the people's representatives in this House. If you take the whole Resolution which our esteemed friend has brought, it only deals with sickness in public sector. Therefore, I will restrict myself to that part. It doesn't mean that sickness is there in public sector alone. The Government has to address itself to sickness wherever it is. As regards the sickness in public sector, well, the Government has to address itself more because the Government is the promoter. It is perceived to be an ideal promoter. The idea behind the Government becoming a promoter is to set an example. That is why public sector companies were not included in this Sick Industrial Companies Act. I don't know what prompted the earlier Government to include public sector undertakings in this Act. It doesn't serve the purpose. Here I would like to repeat-yesterday I said this in this House—that the Sick Industrial companies Act is a Constitutional mandate. Madam, yesterday also you were in the Chair. Now the Minister is here. Section 2 of the Sick Industrial Companies (Special Provisions) Act, 1985 (Act 1 of 1986) says and I quote:

> "It is hereby declared that this Act is for giving effect to the policy of the State towards securing the principles specified in clauses (b) and (c) of article 39 of the Constitution."

Now what do clauses (b) and (c) of article 39 of the Constitution say? I again quote:

> "(b) that the ownership and control of the material resources of the community are so distributed as best to subserve the common good;
>
> (c) that the operation of the economic system does not result in the concentration of wealth and means of production to the common detriment."

Madam, we have not changed the Constitution. As long as we do not change the Constitution, we are bound by it. That is why I say it is not at all necessary for the Government to have included these public sector companies in this Act and provided for a mandate from BIFR

This is an Act which I want all of you to read. Why was it provided? Correspondence between the Ministry of Industrial development and banks and financial institutions were going on. Today they go for money to the financial institutions and banks.

It was told by the then Government in 1982 to banks and financial institutions that if a company, not on a Government company, but a private company, becomes sick, it is a loss to the nation. It is a productive asset, whether it is private or public. Bank's money has been involved in it. Financial institutions have been involved in it. They should find it out at the incipient stage itself when the sickness starts. They should control it at that stage and see to it that it becomes healthy. There are symptoms. These symptoms have to be seen by banks and financial institutions. When I support this Resolution, I say, so far as sickness is concerned, it is not a monopoly of the public sector. I think nobody would disagree with me on that score. If it is not a monopoly of the public sector, sickness of the public sector or the private sector should not be isolated. The sickness of the public sector, as Shri Chaturvedi has correctly said—he knows it better as former C&AG—has a big scope. they have taken over from fertilizer sector to the smallest sector. Diagnosis cannot be in totality. It may have to be on a case-by-case basis. It may have to be sector-wise. Mr. Maran is sitting here because he is the Minister of Industry. But it concerns the Fertilizer Ministry. It concerns the Power Ministry. It concerns the Ministry of Textiles. So far as the sector-wise sickness is concerned, the basis factor, the most important factor is how you find out the sickness. Then a point comes that the public sector is not efficient. If it is not efficient, it is bound to be sick. Mr. Chaturvedi has touched it. I would like to harp on it. What is efficiency? If in engineering and in science, efficiency is calculated on the basis of output divided by input, I can take you to many sick units and tell you, "Yes, here is a machine. Its output and input satisfied this." Is it efficiency? One is technical efficiency. Are you talking of technical efficiency alone? In a fertilizer plant, in a steel plant, if it is in the public sector, I do not understand how and on what basis you could have a net worth of a company where pricing is done by someone else. Fertilizer prices have been fixed which is called administered pricing. If profit and loss business is administered, why do you say that the net worth of this company is negative and that the company should be referred to the BIFR? Did you give it freedom that it could have its own prices? Why did not you do it? That is the public sector philosophy. I don't want to comment on that. I am talking about the whole concept. Is it technical efficiency? Mr. Chaturvedi has used the words allocative efficiency. It is economic allocation. If the allocative efficiency is there in the public sector, that efficiency has to be taken into account before you talk about efficiency in a very vague way. I will not talk about the management, though here it is mentioned 'inefficient management'. There is one word which is not being used. I have always been giving credit to the private sector for one type of efficiency, i.e. the manipulative efficiency. This word 'manipulative' should also be used. How do you change the prices? How does the Chairman of a private company go to a Minister and talk to him? I am not talking of this Government or that Government. I am not on that. How do you manipulate the import duty? How do you find out the details of the Budget earlier so that you can manipulate? How do you manipulate NPAs? so far as manipulative efficiency is concerned, I don't say that the pubic sector does not have it. But there Private Sector excel. I am not talking of manipulative eficiency also. When we are talking of efficiency, allocative efficiency must be taken into account. What were the reasons for sickness? When the new Industrial Policy was declared in 1991-92, some public sector undertakings were

treated as sick and some were treated as chronically sick. According to a report published in 1991, Symptoms of sickness and Categorisation of Public Sector Companies, out of 244 companies, 98 were categorised as sick.

About 55 or 56 units were categorised as chronically sick. Out of the 98 sick units, 46 units were taken over from the private sector. This was done not a hundred years ago but was done in the seventies or the eighties. This burden was taken over from the private sector. The explanation that was given was that these private sector units had become sick and in order to protect the interests of the workers, these units were taken over. That was not the only reason why these units were taken over. That was not the only reason why these units were taken over. Was the wagon manufacturing factory taken over only to protect the workers interest? eighty-five per cent of the wagon manufacturing units are located in West Bengal. I do not want to talk about that area. I want to restrict myself to Tamil Nadu and Maharashtra. Wagon manufacturing factories were taken over not only to protect the interests of workers, but also to protect the national interest. What about Jessop? All these are capital goods industries and no substitute is available for them. I had made one point while discussing the BIFR and Dr. Manmohan Singh had also agreed to it. But this has not been included in the agenda of the BIFR. In a capitalist country also, before shutting down a sick unit, two things are calculated. Firstly, they calculate the replacement cost. If a product has a market, then you will have to replace it because the product has to be produced. You may do it by either importing it or by producing it. Add to this the cost of creating the infrastructure. After doing this exercise, if you say that the factory is not viable, I can understand. But the BIFR is not taking this into account. Dr. Manmohan Singh had agreed to this. But this is not being done. As regards fertilizer units, I do not want the seven fertilizer units to be run just to protect the interests of the 15,000 or 20,000 employees working there. These public sector fertilizer units have been referred to the BIFR and they are lying there since five years. They have not been revived. The Experts Committee and the Government's own report say that it can produce 22 lakh tonnes of urea if it is revived. Today we are importing urea by paying thousands of crores of rupees. Tell me, what economics is this? What is the philosophy behind this? Can you justify this? Any person who has a nationalistic feeling will not justify it. Ours is a poor country and we have been doing this for the last five years. Committees after committees have been appointed. Ultimately, what happened? Mr. Narayanasamy referred to the Haldia factory. To have another Haldia factory, you will require Rs. 2,500 crores. But you can revive the existing Haldia factory at a cost of Rs. 900 crores. This is simple arithmetic. What are you talking about? I have been told a number of times that it is not techno-economically viable. What has happened to IDPL? Someone from the Government was saying that it was not techno-economically viable, but if some one else could take it over, it could be made viable. Madam, this is not techno-economic language. If you say that the problem is with ownership, the management, I can understand. But you are saying that it will not be techno-economically viable as long as it is in the public sector. I cannot understand this. You are saying that it will be techno-economically viable if the ownership changes. This betrays all theories of industrial economics.

That is not possible. If it is techno-economically viable, it has to be techno-economically viable whether the ownership is X,Y, Z or whatever it is. So this is the point where the sickness of public sector industries is getting mixed up. Firstly, a tremendous sort of campaign is going on against this. I am sure this Government will not do it because it means the owner himself

owns. The owner himself says, "My management is all bad, my workers are all bad, everything is bad, my product is not good." Then who is going to have it? Even in the management side I can cite hundreds and thousands of managers in the private sector who have worked in public sector. How is it that he becomes super-efficient when he joins the private sector? He leaves the public sector and joins the private sector and he becomes super-efficient. What is it that is not working? You see, I can see the list. Even those big, big names you see in the Confederation of Indian Industry, how many have the background of public sector? What was there in fifties and sixties in industries so far as this country is concerned? This question is not of management. The question is, what has been the main problem in public and private sectors in other ways. Here the problem has been accountability. —accountability and powers. These two, we could not fix up. How far powers could be given so that he is made accountable? If power is given that does not mean he misuses power and there is no accountability. This is one problem that has been at the root of sickness. This is so far as management is concerned. But the major point of all these sick industries, out of which 50 per cent of these sick industries were inherited from the private sector, has been lack of modernisation—lack of modernisation and upgradation of technology. When we took it over, I remember one case, Hooghly Dock & Port, and that was the case which was taken over in 1933. Mrs. Gandhi was there at that time. Before taking over it was insisted, "You make a report and give us a report about the reasons for the sickness of these units and they can be made healthy." Under the command of someone, the report was made. The weaknesses were identified, the strengths were identified and a report was made. Rs. 8 cores of investment was required in three years. So that becomes a modern ship repairing company. What was done? From 1983 onwards till date, we are talking about short-term revival plan. The salaries were paid. The expenditure was done. But this capital investment of Rs. 9 crores which was to be done in three years could not be done in 12 years. What will happen? You cannot compete in that case. Most of these cases are of modernisation and once modernisation is not done then it starts running on losses. We went on making up the cash losses and these cash losses became more and more. Liability became very heavy. If I want to revive these units immediately from the Government, book adjustment has to be done. With that liability and with the existing losses these cannot be viable and there is no mystery about it. Any company, and sickness, any sick man also requires certain medicine. He cannot survive with sickness as it is. With those liabilities, the company cannot survive. The first and foremost thing is, it has to be revived and it can be revived if you restructure it. If it shuts down, what happens? When our Chief Minister wrote a letter to the then Prime Minister he had mentioned this point very specifically. He had told about these companies and he had diagnosed it. Supposing it had not run, what happens? What happens to these liabilities? This remains your liability. This money which you have invested remains you money. In whatever way you adjust the money, it is adjusted.

If you sell the assets, you don't know how much you will get. You are not going to get the bank interest, the Government interest if you just wind up a sick company. These things should be taken up separately. Restructure the capital, waive the interest and then say whether a techno-economic revival package is possible or not. That has to be the approach in regard to a sick company so far as the public sector is concerned. BIFR or no BIFR, for revival of a sick company, time is the essence. Time is the essence for the revival of a sick company and it has been one thing which no one is worried about. I have been talking about the fertiliser sector since 1986. Mr.

Ahluwalia is not here. He talks about the Snam Progetti report. Actually, it was M/ s. Halder-Torsoe report. That was made in 1986. That report said that if so much money was made available, production could be guaranteed. Normally, what happens is that a Committee is constituted. Then, another committee is constituted. For Haldia, there were eight Committees. When time is the essence of revival, then revival cost will also increase. When the revival cost goes up, then you again have to give the justification as to why it has gone up and whether it is justifiable. Out of many sick units which have been referred to the BIFR, lack of modernisation and time of revival have been the major reasons for their sickness. How do we sort them out? I am not going into the question of public sector, the CMP and other things. I am specifically talking about the sick units which stand referred to the BIFR. The very reference to the BIFR is the main reason for sickness. Once a company is referred to the BIFR, it is not going to get the orders. Then, what is the purpose of talking about it? Some 3-4 years ago, there was an order issued by the Defence Ministry. There was a starred Question also on that. It said that if a company was referred to the BIFR, such a company could not be registered as a supplier. This was made applicable even to the public sector units. So, once a company is referred to the BIFR, it is not going to get the orders. No one is going to give it the orders. Even if it gets some orders, where is the working capital? Who is going to give it the necessary working capital? What is said about the holding-on operation? That was the decision. The BIFR may take six months or one year. Within that period, a revival package should be made. Till a revival package is made, the holding-on operation will continue. That is, you hold on to the position where it was before. But in most of the sick public sector units, it can be seen that the companies have become more sick after they are referred to the BIFR. I don't blame the BIFR so far as the public sector cases are concerned. Frankly speaking, in most of the public sector cases, the BIFR has taken the decisions and made its recommendations, right or wrong, to the Government. The whole story begins after that Mr. Chaturvedi has said about that Mr. Maran knows about that, but he cannot say nor can the earlier Industry Minister. What happens is that in the BIFR, the Government is represented by the Ministry concerned. If it is a fertiliser company, then the Government will be represented by the Fertiliser Ministry. There will be hearings—one, two, three, four, five, six and so on. The revival package is prepared by the operating agency. This agency can appoint a consultant also. Then, that consultant prepares the revival package. Then the bank or the financial institution, the operating agency, a Government representative and a representative of the union will sit together in a joint meeting and express what their objections are whether they are agreeable to the revival package, etc. When the joint meeting is there, the Government is represented by the Ministry concerned. But after the package is adopted, then it has to get the permission from the Cabinet. It has to go to the Finance Ministry. Then, a Committee of Secretaries will go through it. They will have some objections. It again come back. Then, extension of time is taken by the concerned unit. I can show you a number of cases. If the private promoters do that, they do that for other purposes. Their purposes are different. If they find the BIFR's decision not to their liking, they would try to say that they are not agreeable to that and they will not also allow any other promoter to come in. It is not the case in the public sector. I am trying to tell the Minister as sweetly as possible because I promised him to do so.

SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI: He will respond to you also as sweetly as possible.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: I think the agenda has been very well fixed

already. We are not going through that. There is no Member in this House who can say that he is not worried about sickness in public sector units. The question is how to revive them, how to have a comprehensive revival plan. These are the suggestions I am giving to Mr. Maran. These were the suggestions that I had given to the former Minister of Industry and the former Minister of Finance. In the fertiliser case, I had gone to the Finance Ministry. So, if you feel that the revival package has to be accepted by your committee of Secretaries and then by your group of Ministers, you cannot blame him on that. My humble suggestion is, when I go to BIFR I would like to have that group of Ministers there and in one sitting I would like to have it decided whether it is being revived or it is not being revived. Is it wrong? Otherwise, if you take time—six months, one year in taking decision, the cost of revival will have further increased. Then you will have to make another package. I can cite one specific case while referring to his Ministry. It was raised when he was not the Minister. Madam, it involved Rs. 4 crores. The operating agency had agreed. The union had agreed to make sacrifices, because the unions have to make certain sacrifices. The banks had agreed. This package was sent but the Finance Ministry took four months to decide whether that investment should be made by the Government or not. This is a very big company and the investment involved is only Rs. 4 crores. Then, I wrote a letter to the then Prime Minister that the Ministry of Industry can't take decision on investment of Rs. 4 crores whereas a Panchayat can take such a decision in less time. So, today the cost of that package would have increased further. You take it out of the BIFR because BIFR doesn't have the expertise that the Government of India has. If a revival package for a fertiliser unit has to be made, if a revival package for an engineering unit has to be made, the expertise that is available with the Government, is not available with BIFR. They appointment an operating agency. The engage consultants and these consultants are mostly private consultants. These private consultants have their own ways. But I will not go into that. But because the Government has the expertise, you can get the revival report made in the Government itself. Then comes the question of workers making sacrifice. Madam, during the last five years through this Golden Handshake—beacause time is of essence—the erosion of manpower in the public sector has been to the tune of one lakh. And it is not only the skilled workers and qualified engineers, etc. but other also. This erosion in manpower, this reduction in manpower for the sake of revival has been accepted. So, as far as the Government is concerned, the reliefs and concessions are there. The workers have to make sacrifices; those are there. The State Government has to give certain reliefs and concessions. Those are there. Then what for do your equire BIFR! So, I suggest and recommend strongly that for public sector so far as the Government is concerned, it is to be an ideal promoter. The tripartite business that was suggested earlier, did work. In 1992, the then Prime Minister agreed on a tripartite arrangement for the Ministry of Industry. The arrangement was that the employers, the employees and the union will sit together, make a certain package and that package will be acceptable to everyone. We had made revival packages for fifteen such industries. But some whow the Cabinet did not approve of that. So, I would suggest that the concerned Ministry should be given that power. You have the Government of India's representative, the State Government's representative, a representative of the trade union of that company, a representative of the bank and have an external expert. You take an expert of that particular line. There could be an expert in fertilisers, an expert in engineering, an expert in textiles. Take their help, the way you have taken the help of SITRA. Have this body. Let

them make a package and say that this company is revivable. Suppose some case is not revivable, then what is to be done? What will happen to those companies which are beyond redemption, beyond revival? Madam, it has never been the tradition in any industry. Again, I am telling that I am not talking about Marxism; I am talking about Capitalism also. The Japanese Productivity Council has given us the main idea as to how they have revived. What have they said? They said that they treat the worker and labour as the biggest asset. I am not talking about China. Yesterday, I said that capital and labour make an industry. We will have capital retructuring; we will have investment as and where required; we will have technology as and where required, but you cannot have any industrialisation, you cannot have a revival where you just try to turn your head from the labour factor. This is not something that we will have the capital restructuring, and the industry will be restructured. No. The labour has to be taken into consideration. The redeployment, retraining business has failed, flopped. It is all in the name. Why will they be redeployed? We are talking about it, Mr. Chaturvedi also talked about it. Have you made any survey about the one lakh workers who have taken voluntary retirement? Has any survey been made to find out how many of them have been redeployed? They have gone and some of them have got their jobs elsewhere. It is not redeployment and retraining. Those who don't have jobs and who have lost their jobs are still there without any work. If you want that the workers have to be taken into confidence, then I suggest that you should also associate the unions of the sick undertakings in the formulation of revival package. Make this system, make this case as a solid case for revival. A comprehensive revival cannot be done without the participation of workers. It has to be done with the willingness, with the will-power of the Government. It has to be done with participation from the State Governments. So, where does the BIFR come? I don't understand why BIFR should be required for these public sector companies. This is the only way that a comprehensive revival plan can be drawn for these companies.

Madam, so far as the exist policy is concerned, the voluntary retirement scheme is concerned, these are all connected with the industry. It is not that in a particular industry; in industry after industry, it has been seen that where the turnover has come down, the manpower is shown as excess. Today, the capacity utilisation of a public sector undertaking has come down to 35 per cent. I don't understand as to what arithmetic is working there. If the production of Haldia factory is taken nil, then the whole manpower is surplus. Is it the way of calculating the surplus manpower? And this is what is being done. In case after case, we find that it is being taken that overhead cost is excess, manpower is excess. What is the capacity utilisation? The capacity utilisation is 20 per cent, 25 per cent. If the capacity utilisation is less, then the manpower, overhead cost will always be high. So, you bring up the capacity utilisation first and then talk about overhead cost and other things.

Now, I take productivity. In the productivity case, I was talking about trade-union business that trade-unions are not co-operating, trade-unions' productivity is not there. In one particualr company's case when the productivity is talked about in an engineering industry, I asked the management; "Kindly tell as to what your unit of productivity is. You must have your unit of productivity. Productivity means what? One *tola*, two *tola*, half kilogram, one kilogram. Have you made any work study? Have you put up any industrial engineering." That particular unit did not have any industrial engineering. So, how will they fix up what the productivity is? Generally, productivity does not mean anything.

There should be some parametres for productivity. Those parametres are not there. So, the question of productivity comes only when you have the real planning for revival. In an idle work, without working capital, what productivity can you have? Do you know the motto of the trade-union to which I belong? Do you know what is the battle, what is the cry before us, what has been our call for the industry and the trade-union? It is, "know your indstry". Is it wrong in any way if any trade union wants to tell you something about your company? What can be the other better ideology? This is the first and foremost view that we have to set in our mind. In many cases, the trade unions like INTUC, CITU, etc. in the sick industries have combined and have made a revival package. The revival package of IDPL was possible only because the officers and the trade unions sat together. I would like to repeat that we should take the sick companies out of the purview of the BIFR. We should form some committees as has also been suggested by our Chief Minister. Let us have these revival packages sector-wise and on case to case basis. If there is any difficulty, the concerned agencies can be called. This is the only way to revive the sick Industries. Even SCOPE has agreed and everyone else has said that the experience of BIFR has shown that it has totally failed. Let this House at least come to the conclusion that so far as the public sector is concerned, the BIFR is not going to be a solution. The solution lies with us. We should take our own decision across the table. We should have revival packages by taking the help of experts, trade unions, State Governments, financial institutions, etc. We should look at the problem on case to case basis and not as public sector and the private sector. Thank you.

SHRI SURINDER KUMAR SINGLA (Punjab): Madam, I thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak. Madam, my esteemed friend, Chaturvediji, has emphasised a pioneering role for the public sector for industrialisation of this country. In '50s and '60s when the entrepreneur did not have the funds and the requisite technical expertise, the State became an entrepreneur. Mr. Mukherjee says that the Government is an ideal promotor of industries. Yes, in '50s and '60s the Government did become a promotor, did become an entrepreneur. But it is unfortunate now to expect the State and its institutions to perform this act and perform the entrepreneurial role. It should not and it cannot. The basic point is that the State can never, be a promotor and cannot play an entrepreneurial role. I am really surprised that Mr. Mukherjee is talking about it.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: Do not take my name. ...(*Interruptions*)...

सिंगला जी, मैं पानी पीकर आता हूं। इस बीच मेरा नाम मत लीजिएगा।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (कुमारी सरोज खापर्डे): मिस्टर मुखर्जी, अभी सिंगला जी का भाषण शुरू नहीं हुआ और आप पानी पीने चल दिए।

SHRI SURINDER KUMAR SINGLA (Punjab): I am surprised to see that on. One side everybody says and expects that the private sector should function independently and it should have full autonomy. I have heard speeches from the other side and they say that the Government must play an active role. What model actually do we want? On the one hand, we are saying that there is an over-interference by the Government in the functioning of the public sector which is jeopardising its economic viability; and on the other hand, Mr. Dipankar Mukherjee asks as to why the Government should not take a decision. Does he want to suggest that the Government should take total control of the public sector and abolish the boards of various companies.

Is that the approach you are suggesting? I am just astonished at the way that you want to function. I know there are sick units both in the public sector as well as in the private sector. If

the public sector suffers from inefficiency, the reason is, lack of working capital funds and it is equally true with the private sector. But this country has to address itself as to how to deal with the growing sickness. The industrial enterprises are growing sick, not in one area but in area after area. I want to address these issues, particularly, to Mr. Maran. I am saying, if you address a certain company is not having sufficient funds and you want that that company's bad debt or bad loan must be waived, then the Marxist friends of mine would raise a hue and cry for two or three reasons: catch hold of the banks, the financial institutions, the Reserve Bank of India; why did you lay-off, why did you allow waiving to a public or a private sector company? And, the fact is, you are passing this total sickness from one industry to another financial institution. Why do you not search? He has just deliberately ignored the sick companies aspect in the West Bengal region. Would he like to know from me, if he does not know, that public sector and private sector companies which are sick in that area have also made financial institutions sick? When you say, "you offer concessions, you wright off the penal interest by banks which have invested in a company," are you not trying to make the bank also sick? You cannot do it. You cannot, really. After all, even banks money is your money. The financial institutions' money is your money. When you go to the BIFR, what happens? All kinds of packages and announcements are made and the banks are forced to accept all kind of concessions and sacrifice various institutions to run a company. I can quote company after company which I am aware of in my State. A company in the State sector like the Punjab National Fertilizer Corporation became sick not for one reason but many reasons. But the basic reason was the National Fertilizers Limited does not give the raw material. If it gives the raw material, then it is viable. Occasionally they restore the supply; sometimes they do not, and the company cannot be run efficiently, whatever you do. First, there was an attempt, as Mr. Mukherjee, rightly said and on this issue I am extremely in agreement with him for the first time. He said, 'time is the essence of revival.' He made such a significant point; time is the essence of revival'. Either you revive at that point of time or you just lose the unit. You cannot revive it later. Time is the real essence. You revive it today because you are in a position to revive it. If you do not revive it today and if you postpone its revival year after year and chew, then you would be losing it and you are going to waste all the productive resources in the country. Madam, imagine, this country has invested something like Rs. 1,80,000 crores in the public sector undertakings.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: Madam, is he supporting or opposing?

SHRI SURINDER KUMAR SINGLA: You listen to me. I will come to you later.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Mr. Mukerjee, Mr. Singla has mentioned for the first time that he is supporting your view. You should show some kind of decency by getting up and congratulating Mr. Singla.

SHRI M.A. BABY: Madam, he is totally unnerved.

SHRI SURINDER KUMAR SINGLA: I will tell you where I stand. He knows. He is trying to understand further. Now, I do not know where I stopped.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: Madam, you remind him about the ruling which you gave yesterday. He is not aware of your ruling.

SHRI SURINDER KUMAR SINGLA: As I was mentioning, the Punjab unit, the PNFC, is sick today. It sought a subsidy from the Ministry of Fertilisers. The Ministry did give subsidy to the unit. The question is: is this the way we are going to run? After that, the plant could not be run. It came to the BIFR. the BIFR did offer a concessional

package. The BIFR forced the bankers to pump in more money for running the unit. But ultimately, as there was no economic viability, the Punjab Government wrote letter after letter to the financial institutions to give some concessions to the unit to make it viable. And they did. For the third time—you may be surprised; it may surprise you—the unit is again being referred to the BIFR. In fact, it is before the BIFR now. (*Interruptions*)

The point I am making is: you cannot make a permanently sick unit a functional unit. But if you are interested in wasting the country's productive resources, you are entitled to think on those lines. I have nothing to say.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: What about the National Fertilisers Limited?

SHRI SURINDER KUMAR SINGLA: What I would say is, if the country, if the Parliament, decides that a unit has to be considered as a commercial unit, there should be no outside agency like the BIFR. You can scrap the BIFR. I know that a number of private industry people just wait for the stipulated period to be over so that a reference can be made to the BIFR. They deliberately make the unit sick and enjoy those concessions, to run it later. That is why I say, you can scrap the BIFR. Give the power the financial institutions who have a stake and interest in this. They have the resources. It is their resources.

Now, if you are going to have a Committee, if you say the NPA is 20 per cent or 17 per cent, somebody makes a commercial lending; if Mr. Chidambaram and Mr. Maran, afterwards, make certain policy pronouncements, considering the pre-reform and the post-reform policies, where you have a steep decline in the customs duty coming, what is the fault of the management in this? The unit becomes unmarketable; it is impossible to run it. If you have this kind of policies of the post-reform period, over which the management has no control because these are Government's policies, it is policy-induced sickness of industries. If you have this kind of a policy-induced sickness, the management is not at fault.

What I would suggest is that you should give freedom to the financial institutions to look after this. This is a permanent feature all over the world. It is the bankers and the financial institutions. They know whether a unit can be revived or not. It is only they who know whether it is possible—while projecting, say, a ten-year picture of market possibilities—for the unit to survive or not. It is only the bankers who can know. But what do you do? You ask the BIFR. Who are the people sitting in the BIFR? Retired Secretaries of the Government of India. They become super-bankers. They direct the bankers to do this or that. As he said, even then, it is not mandatory. These people are looking for lucrative jobs. They have the power to waive off certain things. They act like super-bankers. On the other hand, they really do not know anything. They do not know whether an industry can function or not.

What you should do is, you should allow the normal system of market economy to function; not the extra structures of interference that you want to evolve—Committee of Secretaries.

The second point I want to make, apart from the Government interference, is this. It is really important for a variety of reasons. Suppose there is an industry which can never be revived. The reasons are two. One is that the industry has had a very high technological obsolescence rate. For example, you are producing one kind of computer, and a new kind of computer comes. There is technological obsolescence. If a superior technology product comes, you will not have market for the older product. So, why do you want to revive those units?

Chaturvediji has been mentioning a lot of experiences. I just want to mention an experience of a friend of mine, a classmate of mine. If I tell you, it is a

horrifying story. He was a very bright person, a very bright student. He topped in F.Sc. He topped in the engineering college. He got the top job in the Heavy Engineering Corporation at Ranchi. Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru fondly used to call it the mother of engineering companies. He went there and joined the top job. That was his first job. After five or ten years, the company started growing sick. Nobody could help it. You cannot be thrown out of the job. The man was leaving that job. When you become irrelevant, when you are not performing your job, the Central Government budget is easily available to sick companies in the country. Pump in money, the poor man's money. If you are going to divert money to sick companies through the budget of the Indian people, then, you are playing a nasty and notorious game. You are denying the millions of people of this country *roti* and food. Do you want to serve the constituency of a few lakh people, or do you want to serve all the people of this country? You are looking after your own constituency. You have to look after all the poor poeple of this country.

Madam, this friend, this classmate of mine could not get a job elsewhere. He himself became sick. If you want to keep a sick industry alive, if you are going to keep all paralytic and sick employees, if you want to keep all sick employees who have become redundant but are not going out, the company cannot be revived. If it is technologically impossible to revive a sick company, why do you not shut it down deliberately? There has to be a mortality rate of such industrial companies, such industrial projects all over the world.

SHRI M. A. BABY: Will you please yield for a minute?

SHRI SURINDER KUMAR SINGLA: Yes.

SHRI M.A. BABY: Madam, if this philosophy that economically non-viable units are to be closed down is to be followed, then, as the Government of India is running on deficit for many years over, you have to wind up the Government of India and hand it over to the private sector.

SHRI SURINDER KUMAR SINGLA: The Government is a private sector. It is the Government of the people of this country. It is not a Government of only the Marxists. It is the Government of the people of this country. It is a private sector. You and me are in competitive business of politics. You cmpete with me, and I compete with you. So, there is a free market of politics. Why are you afraid of having free market in economic circles? Politics is a free market. Can you deny this? ...(*Interruptions*)

Don't fight. My point is this. Can you say that you will not let anybody else fight in West Bengal? It is a free market in politics.

श्री जलालुदीन अंसारी: यहां की जनता ने आपको बाजार से हटा दिया। ...(व्यवधान)...

†श्री जलालुदीन अंसारी: यहां की जनता ने आपको बाजार से हटा दिया। ...(व्यवधान)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (कुमारी सरोज खापर्डे): अंसारी साहब आज कई लोग इस विषय पर बोले हैं और सिंगला जी चुप्पी साधे हुए थे। इसलिए आपको भी उन्हें सुनना चाहिए।

श्री सुरेन्द्र कुमार सिंगला: मैडम, मैं सबको सुन रहा था, लेकिन मैंने किसी को इन्टरेप्ट नहीं किया।

उपसभाध्यक्ष: वही मैं कह रही हूं। आपने किसी को इन्टरेप्ट नहीं किया इसलिए उनको भी आपको इन्टरेप्ट नहीं करना चाहिए।

SHRI SURINDER KUMAR SINGLA: Madam, this is something which is causing us great concern. Let the resources of the Indian Government not be wasted in the public sector. They

†[] Transliteration in Arabic Script.

cannot really be revived. I normally say and I repeat here that only the poor people have the first charge on the Indian Budget. Nobody can claim anything on the Budget, except the poor people.

Madam, as I was saying, had that boy been in some good company, he would have been the most powerful man in the company. But, he stuck to the job and became sick. I am not against it. As I said in the beginning, the public sector units have performed an extremely good job in developing this country and in industrialising this nation. Nobody can deny it. I very strongly feel that there are public sector undertakings in the country, which have a place of pride. The fact of the matter is if they are allowed a free hand, they can do an excellent job for the country.

My next point is—I think it is more to the philosophy of the mankind—that everywhere in the world, the public sector resources are being squandered. It is a known fact that the public sector undertakings all over the world have failed. If you compare the cost structure of a particular industry, where you have a public sector unit and also a private sector unit, you will find that there is enormous wastage of resoruces in the public sector.

To begin with, I had made a point that the State cannot be an entrepreneur. It is the individual, who can be an entrepreneur. I do not need to give an example of persons like Bill Gates in this country. It is the system of competitiveness that provides entrepreneurs. It was his commercially profitable ideas that the American capital market and its financial institutions have funded to make him the richest person in the world today. So, it is the very drive and entrepreneurship in him that brought in the best talent, and vice-versa. I have quoted the story of my friend. If you are there in the public sector undertaking and your job is secure, you really do not work. In this context I would suggest that the Government should seriously think of scrapping Article 311 of the Constitution whereby everybody is permanent. You cannot really do your best, job, where you know your job is secure whether you do the work or not. So, Article 311 needs to be reviewed.

Madam, I now come to another point.

5.00 P.M.

I will come to another point. I want to narrate a story about the National Textile Corporation.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Now, it is 5 o'clock, you cannot narrate it. You can do it next time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): May I request you to continue your speech on this Resolution next time as and when the day is allotted for this Resolution? It is already 5 o'clock. There is a listed business before me. I would like to go ahead according to that business. I hope you would not mind.

SHRI SURINDER KUMAR SINGLA: Okay. I would resume my speech next time.

THE BUDGET (RAILWAYS) 1997-98

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Now we will take up the general discussion on the Railway Budget for 1997-98. The time allotted for this discussion is 8 hours. I have a list of speakers here. Now, I would request Prof. Ram Kapse to initiate the discussion on the Railway Budget.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU (West Bengal) : Madam, you have said that the time alloted for this debate is 8 hours. So, how long will you continue today? Is there an idea? We can discuss it for 2 hours today and the rest of the speakers can speak tomorrow.

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): How long would you like to sit in the House?

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pandicherry): Today being Friday, we can sit up to 7 o'clock.